

The Office of this JOURNAL and of the WEEKLY REPORTER is now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.

We must draw the attention of correspondents to the rule that all letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, OCTOBER 3, 1874.

DURING THE REMAINDER of the Long Vacation the Master of the Rolls will sit for Vice-Chancellor Hall, as Vacation Judge, and the weekly sittings will be held at the Rolls House. Papers must, as heretofore, be left at the Vice-Chancellor's chambers, and applications for leave to give notice of motion may be made to his chief clerk.

WE UNDERSTAND that Mr. W. H. Cooke, Q.C., Judge of County Court Circuit No. 32 (Norwich), is to be transferred to Circuit No. 36 (Oxford), recently vacated by the resignation of Mr. J. B. Parry, Q.C.

THE PROVISION in THE REFORM ACT (section 27) requiring six months' residence in, or within seven miles of, a borough as one of the conditions of qualification for being registered as a voter for such borough, seems to be creating considerable dismay. A practice has grown up of letting houses for a month or two in summer, reserving one or two rooms, with the idea that this reservation will suffice to preserve the right of the absentees to be retained on the list of voters. It appears that, on the revision at Guildford a few days ago, all the persons who had adopted this course were objected to, and the objections were allowed by the revising barrister, who founded his decision on *Ford v. Pye* (L. R. 9 C. P. 269). In that case one clergyman exchanged duties and house with another for two months, retaining two rooms in the house. The court held that this amounted to a break in the residence. "The mere fact of absence," said Keating, J., "as long as there is liberty of returning, and no abandonment of the intention to return whenever the person pleases, will not prevent there being a constructive residence; but if the person has deprived himself of the liberty of returning by letting the premises, or has abandoned the intention of returning, as in the present case, he cannot be said to be residing." These expressions, it will be observed, point to either (1) the lack of power to return, or (2) the lack of intention to return, as being sufficient of itself to constitute a break of residence. It seems to have been proved or admitted in *Ford v. Pye* that the absentee had no intention of returning, and, in the view which the court took, it was unnecessary to decide whether by the mere exchange of houses, with a reservation of the rooms, the residence was broken. In *Powell v. Guest* (13 W. R. 274, 18 C. B. N. S. 72), where confinement in a gaol, more than seven miles from the borough, was held to constitute a break in the "residence" under the Reform Act, the judges seem to base their decision on the ground that the prisoner was absolutely debarred from returning, and they admit that imprisonment for debt, or imprisonment with an option of paying a fine, would not have had that effect, because the prisoner, by paying the debt or fine, might remove his disability to return. The principle underlying this decision is, that where by possibility the absentee might return, and no voluntary abandonment of intention to return can be proved or presumed, no break in the residence will occur. The reservation of part of the house no doubt in itself raises a presumption of intention to return, and if that presumption is not displaced, the reasoning in *Ford v. Pye* would justify the decision that

the residence is not broken. But the intention of the absentee in each case is clearly a material element, and if the reservation be merely colourable—that is to say, if there is no intention ever to take advantage of it—then, under the authority of *Ford v. Pye*, the residence must be held to have been broken.

THE FIRST REPORT of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the transactions of the Paymaster-General on behalf of the Court of Chancery, presents some features of considerable interest. Formerly the Court of Chancery would not accept a transfer of any securities except Government Securities and a few others of special descriptions, but here we have a list of about seventy public companies and Foreign Governments whose stocks, shares, or bonds, are now held by the Paymaster-General on behalf of the Court of Chancery, in addition to several descriptions of Government securities. The cash in court, which consists of £3,948,384, is credited to suitors upon the books, but is in fact not cash at all. It is represented by three items—namely, £329,939 7s. cash actually in the bank, £2,423,340 15s. 6d. debt due from the Consolidated Fund and £1,195,104 1s. 7s. due from the National Debt Commissioners for stock transferred to them. The report states that the Commissioners have not furnished their accounts, and suggests that they "should be required to render an account comprising the whole of their transactions with the Court of Chancery, whether in stock or cash." Judging from what is generally known of the mysterious body referred to, we do not apprehend that the accounts required will very speedily be rendered or that, when obtained, they will prove very satisfactory. The Commissioners are permitted to deal with the balances of the suitors as if they were the property of the nation, and are allowed otherwise to manipulate the greater part of the moving balances of securities, and it is not probable that they will be very willing to show the amount of the profit they have gained for the public out of this use of the suitors' money, or to reveal in detail the mode in which it has been acquired. A remarkable feature in this report is the low figure at which the new and inconvenient system of deposit accounts appears. The cash on deposit amounts only to £595,586 and the interest credited is £2,272—that is, rather less than 8s. per cent. on the total. Seeing how small is the amount gained in the way of interest, and how great is the inconvenience of the system of deposit, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that "the game is not worth the candle."

A DECISION reported in a recent number of a French law journal indicates a point in which the law of France differs from our own. The report gives a history of the devices by which a person employed in a manufactory contrived to discover and reveal to another house the secret of the manufacture of a particular colour invented and used by the firm which he served. This seems to have been treated as a violation of article 378 of the Penal Code, which enacts that, "*Les médecins, chirurgiens et autres officiers de santé, ainsi que les pharmaciens, les sages-femmes, et toutes autres personnes, dépositaires par état ou profession, des secrets qu'on leur confie, qui, hors le cas où la loi les oblige à se porter dénonciateurs, auront révélé ces secrets, seront punis,*" as therein provided. The details stated indicate practices which would have been reached by the English law of larceny; but considered as the revelation of a servant, it would seem not to fall within any means of redress or under any penalty provided by our law. The cases in which the Court of Chancery interposes to prevent the communication of a secret process are cases where the knowledge was acquired by some one to whom it was entrusted, and he is restrained from using his knowledge in such a way as to commit a breach of trust. But where no such trust is reposed (and in the case referred to the defendant was so far from being trusted that every precaution was taken to conceal the matter from him) no trust can be violated; and the

policy of the law is, in providing a protection by patent at once to protect the inventor in an adequate degree, and to secure to the public, in exchange for this privilege, a frank communication; but not to protect those who prefer, by keeping the process secret, to take their protection into their own hands. We should ourselves have supposed that the language of the French Code also required a trust or confidence, but if the recent decision is law we must conclude the contrary.

THE INDUCTIVE SCIENCE OF LAW.

It is an old saying that a straw will show which way the wind blows, and it is one of the oddest testimonies to the present predominance of natural science, that a contemporary has thought it well to occupy its columns during the quiet season of the year by an argument to prove that English case law ought to be ranked among the inductive sciences. The kinship is sought to be established by features of family likeness which the family would hardly recognise; and in reading the article referred to we are reminded of the marks by which the claimant endeavoured to establish his identity with Sir Roger Tichborne, of which some were peculiar to the claimant but not to Sir Roger, some to Sir Roger but not to the claimant, and some were common to the majority of mankind. The writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, who seems to have fallen under the influence of Mr. Fitzjames Stephen or of Mr. Sheldon Amos (for they are both caught in the same snare), exhibits the parallel as follows: "The ultimate object of natural science is to predict events—to say with approximate accuracy what will happen under given conditions.

... The legal result is as definite and capable of prediction as either the mechanical or the physiological one. ... In order to produce physical results we must suppose that the same thing always happens under the same conditions; and in the same way, in order to predict legal results, we must suppose that the same decision is always given on the same facts. ... We cannot make nature uniform. ... But law is made by man, and man can do as he pleases with it. Here it is in our power to make our fundamental axiom approximately true. ... In English case law this object is attained by ... an understanding that the courts shall follow the authority of decisions formerly given on similar facts. ... As the man of science has to predict what will happen under new conditions from what is known to have happened under more or less similar conditions; so the man of law must predict the decision of a new case from what is known to have been decided in more or less similar cases. In order to do this they must both have at hand the recorded results of former experience. For the lawyer those results are to be found in the reports. ... The science of case law being wholly conventional we might, if we chose, absolutely limit the field of observation to reported cases, as it now is practically limited with trifling exceptions, or even to the authorised law reports, without any loss to the scientific character of our work."

It is no doubt true that all knowledge which is not purely historical enables us to predict events with more or less accuracy; but, considering that every prediction is strictly an act of deduction, it is odd, to say the least, that this should be singled out as the characteristic feature of inductive science. But whether prediction is or is not the ultimate object of inductive science, it is certain that there is no worse way of defining anything than by its "ultimate object;" it only needs that the pursuit of the "object" should be pushed far enough—that is, that the object should be really made "ultimate"—to reduce all things to an absolute uniformity. A science at any rate is not characterised as inductive or deductive by the purpose it is designed or found to serve, that is, by the practical application of its scientific results, but by the methods by which its scientific results are reached. The one gathers its principles, in ascending generality,

from observation of instances; the other deduces the more particular consequences from principles already known or admitted. Prediction must in either case consist in the application of some more or less general proposition to a particular state of facts; its accuracy depends in each case equally on the correctness of that proposition, and the correct apprehension of the facts which form the minor premises; and no fact subject to any inductive science can be predicted with more absolute certainty than that if you erect squares upon the three sides of a right-angled triangle, the square of the hypotenuse will equal the other two.

But it is odder still, that to create a uniformity by taking care to verify your own forecast, appears, in the view of the writer, quite sufficient to invest a subject with the quality of scientific prediction. So that the truly scientific man is the obstinate man, for he will be best able to foresee what he will do. The most scientific treatise is the common almanac; for you can predict with absolute certainty (man having so arranged it) that on the expiration of Monday the 31st of January, Tuesday the 1st of February will commence. And the manufacture of inductive science must be considered to have been most completely reduced to a system on board ship, where, on the hour being called, they are accustomed to say "make it so."

With respect to the assertion that "the legal result is as definite and capable of prediction as either the mechanical or the physiological one," it would ill become us as lawyers to contradict so flattering a commendation; we are only too glad to meet with such an emphatic denial of the "proverbial uncertainty of the law." If it fails in exact truth, it bears a corresponding testimony to the sagacity of the writer, who has proved by a long experience the possibility of an unerring judgment. But we cannot pass over the comparison of observations in natural science with decisions upon cases, without calling the writer's attention to a difference which seems to have escaped him. An observation in natural science may be either true or false, which will correspond to an accurate or inaccurate report of a case. But if it is true, it is true absolutely and always, and no true observation can be contradictory of another true observation. But what will happen if a reported case is inconsistent with another reported case? Perhaps the writer would reply that the system forbids the possibility, for "law is made by man, and man can do as he pleases with it." But here is just the difficulty; for the ideal "man" real actual existing "men;" and then we find that, though "man" has often thought he could do as he pleased with law, "men" have thought they could do the same, and have done so accordingly. If men could have made nature act as variously as men have been accustomed to act themselves, we fear that the "natural sciences" would be even less perfect than they are.

What may be the "ultimate object" of the argumentation we have referred to we are somewhat at a loss to guess; but if its purpose was to exhibit either the merits of case law, or the similarity of its method with that of inductive science, we cannot think it is successful. There is a merit in case law, and it is this: that large and necessarily vague general principles are, by means of their authoritative application by decision to particular classes of cases, limited and made more clear and intelligible, and are derived into subordinate rules which render legal relations more certain and better defined; that by the very fact that decisions are authoritative, a more rigorous logic is enforced on those who make them; that rules made with reference to actual circumstances, which force on the mind the consideration of the bearing of the rules on other cognate circumstances, are more likely to correspond to the needs of human life than rules made, as it were, in the air; and that by the introduction from time to time of new rules and principles, the product of experience, old rules less fitted for the present state of things are by degrees antiquated, and are either modified or overthrown. The

number and variety of the subordinate rules created, and the guidance in the interpretation of legal rules which their application by authoritative decision affords, do give in a high degree the character of certainty to the law which is thus constituted. But it is equally true that the facility by which the needs of life are met by the gradual growth of new rules under the authority of case law, is an advantage of not less importance.

It is true, also, that there is a resemblance between the method of inductive science and the method of case law. But the essential point of that resemblance consists in this, that in each the rules are founded upon observation and experience, rather than upon high *a priori* reasoning. The difference is, that in the one case it is sought to discover, by observation of the facts of nature, what are the rules of uniformity which they disclose: in the other it is sought to discover, by observation of the facts of human life, what legal rules most conduce to justice and convenience.

RECENT DECISIONS IN PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW.

II.

(2.) The fictitious *extra territoriality* of an ambassador's residence has received in two decisions from France (pp. 71, 73) a very reasonable limitation; it is held to be limited to the purpose of securing the immunities of the ambassador, and does not enable a subject of the home state to contract a valid marriage there with a subject of the accrediting state, contrary to the provisions of the law of the country, and without the formalities which it requires. There can be no doubt that this is the view taken by English law.

(3.) With respect to the *evidence* of foreign law, we find the following rules laid down by the courts of the German Empire (p. 80) as to cases governed by foreign law:—1. The judge must apply the foreign law so far as it is known to him, founding his determination of it either on his own knowledge, or on such proof by the parties as he deems sufficient. 2. If it is unknown to him, he may require it to be proved, or he may make an official inquiry as to it, but he is not bound to do so. 3. He may presume that the unknown foreign law agrees with the national law. 4. But this presumption may be contested by proof to the contrary offered by the parties, and does not therefore bind the judge to decide in accordance with it.

These rules are not very clear or definite, and the difference between them and the rule which prevails in England will at once appear. The danger of departing from the English rule, which is to treat foreign law as a matter of fact to be proved, is forcibly exemplified by a case referred to under the next head, which relates to

(4.) *Testamentary domicile.* At p. 86 a case is reported from New York, in which the question was as to the validity of a will made by an American lady in France. Proceeding on the rule that a will must be valid according to the law of the testator's domicile at the time of death, which has not been modified in America by any legislation similar to that of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 114, the court found it necessary to determine whether the testatrix had, by her twelve years' residence in France, lost her American and acquired a French domicile, in which latter case the will would have been void. The court appear to have arrived at the conclusion, on reasoning similar to that with which we are familiar in many recent English cases, that the change of domicile was not proved; but in the course of their judgment they consider the bearing of the circumstance that the testatrix had never been naturalised in France according to the provisions of article 13 of the Code Civil, the effect of which article was examined in the case of *Bremer v. Freeman* (10 Moo. P. C. 306). In that case the evidence given by French lawyers as to the effect of non-compliance with article 13 was contradictory, and the court undertook to decide for themselves; they decided that such non-compliance did

not prevent the foreigner in France from acquiring a domicile there which would govern his testamentary disposition; and they adhered to this opinion, notwithstanding the unanimous testimony to the contrary of ten French lawyers of eminence, nominated, on the request of the unsuccessful party, by the Tribunal of the Seine. It appears that, since that judgment, the Cour de Cassation has decided (in a case cited from Sirey by Mr. Lawrence in his Elements of International Law), in accordance with the opinion negated by the Privy Council, that without compliance with article 13 a foreigner cannot acquire a testamentary domicile in France. The court of New York, without following the dangerous precedent set by the Privy Council in *Bremer v. Freeman* (for the French law was not strictly in proof before them), found that, so far as appeared, the effect of the circumstance in question was at least not contrary to the other grounds of fact which induced them to hold that the domicile was not changed, and to pronounce for the validity of the will.

We must observe, however, that the court appear to have thought that if, as was for this purpose assumed, the will would have been held valid in France, though not valid as a French will, because made by a non-domiciled person according to the law of his domicile, this would dispense them from the necessity of further inquiry. But this is surely a fallacy. Probate of a will must be granted by the court of the testator's domicile, and according to the law of that domicile; and that court, though it may rightly determine that a domicile has not been acquired in a country whose laws forbid its acquisition, cannot govern its decision by a consideration of whether the court of a foreign country, which by the hypothesis has not primary jurisdiction over the will, would hold the will valid. On the contrary, that foreign country, repudiating its primary jurisdiction over the will, must govern itself by the decision of the country to which the jurisdiction belongs (see *Dogliani v. Crispin*, L. R. 1 H. L. 301).

(To be continued.)

LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR.

III.

LICENSING.

CAP. 49.—An Act to amend the laws relating to the sale and consumption of Intoxicating Liquors.

This Act is to be construed as one with the Licensing Act of 1872, in which it effects a number of changes, tending chiefly in the direction of relaxation, and in favour of the "licensed person." Some of the most important of these alterations relate to the hours of closing, and come into operation next Saturday (section 2). Section 24 of the Act of 1872 is repealed, and in place of the discretion thereby given to the licensing justices in the country to prescribe the hours of closing, there are enacted (section 3) three fixed scales of hours, relating (1) to the metropolitan district (Sunday night 11, Saturday night 12, other nights 12.30); (2) to other parts of the metropolitan police district, towns and "populous places" (Sunday night 10, other nights 11), and (3) to all other places (all nights 10). By section 11, this scale, as to the hours of closing, is extended to the so-called night, or refreshment houses. A discretion is given to the county licensing committee to direct (section 32) that any collection of houses adjacent to a town shall, for the purposes of the provisions with respect to closing, be deemed to be part of such town; and also to determine what areas, with a population of not less than one thousand, shall "by reason of the density of such population" be considered "populous places" within the Act. In places beyond the metropolitan district, the licensing justices are empowered (section 6), for the purpose of accommodating the hours of closing on Sunday, Good Friday, and Christmas Day to the hours of public worship, to direct that premises in which intoxicating

liquors are sold shall remain closed on those days until 1 o'clock, and from 3 to 6 o'clock. To the thirteen licences already existing there has been added (section 7) a new one, termed an early closing licence, the holder of which is to close an hour earlier at night than the ordinary hour, and in return is to be entitled to an abatement of one-seventh, or, if his licence is a six-day licence, of two-sevenths of the duty otherwise payable by him. The exemption from the hours of closing in favour of premises in the neighbourhood of a theatre is repealed (section 4), but the provisions of sections 26 and 29 of the Act of 1872, relating to orders of exemption and occasional licences, are extended (section 5) to persons licensed to sell beer or cider by retail, to be consumed on the premises.

The penalty for selling intoxicating liquors, or keeping open premises for their sale, during closing hours is unaltered (section 9), but it is expressly extended to permitting liquor purchased before, to be consumed on the premises after, the time of closing. The result is, that instead of a "reasonable time" being allowed for the consumption by customers of liquor bought before the hour of closing (*Cates v. South*, 1 L. T. N. S. 365) the publican must turn out his customers the moment the closing time arrives. Section 30 provides that no person keeping a house licensed under the present Act, or the Act of 1872 (the restriction is singular) shall be liable to any penalty for supplying intoxicating liquors, after the hours of closing, to private friends *bonâ fide* entertained by him at his own expense, and section 10 enables any licensed person to sell intoxicating liquor at any time to persons lodging in his house. We have already discussed (*ante*, p. 845) the provision made by section 10 with reference to the *bonâ fide* traveller, but it may not be amiss to point out here that a person arriving at or departing from a railway station is only on the footing of a *bonâ fide* traveller in so far that liquor may be sold to him "at such station;" and that the section does not say that every person who lodged the night before more than three miles off is a *bonâ fide* traveller, but that no one shall be deemed to be a *bonâ fide* traveller unless he did so. The character of traveller will no longer avail without the distant lodging, but neither will the distant lodging without the character of traveller. We may also note that as regards the defence of the "licensed person"—consisting, in like manner, of the two elements, "truly believed" and "reasonable precaution"—the provision as to the latter is not, as some publicans appear to have read it, "took some precaution," but "took all reasonable precautions."

As regards penalties generally, and the record of convictions on licences, the *minimum* penalty of one pound, prescribed by section 67 of the previous Act, is (section 12) restricted to second and subsequent offences. The recording of convictions for offences on the licence of the offender is in all cases made discretionary (section 13), but is extended to offences against the Adulteration Acts (section 14). The register of licences is to be produced to the court before passing sentence, so that the question whether the offence shall be recorded will always have to be considered by the court. No fee appears to be prescribed for the production by the clerk to the magistrates of the register for this purpose. A conviction for an offence against the Adulteration Acts is to be entered in the register of licences (section 14). An appeal is given from the direction to record an offence on a licence (section 13). Provision is made, by section 15, for the temporary transfer to the owner of a licence which has been forfeited, or the holder of which has become personally disqualified. Any person possessing an estate or interest in licensed premises, as owner, lessee, or mortgagee, prior to that of the occupier, on payment of a fee of a shilling, may be registered as owner, or one of the owners, of the premises (section 29).

In place of the provision of the Act of 1872 authorising a constable at all times to enter on any licensed

premises to examine any part of such premises, and to take an account of all intoxicating liquor stored therein, a power is given (section 16) to a constable to enter "for the purpose of preventing or detecting the violation of any of the provisions" of the Act of 1872 or the present Act, "which it is his duty to enforce." The provisions of section 35 of the Act of 1872, relating to the grant of a search warrant for the detection of liquors sold or kept contrary to law, are repealed, but re-enacted (section 17), with the addition of a clause declaring that on the conviction of the owner or occupier of the premises of such sale, &c., the liquor seized and the vessels containing it shall be forfeited. Persons found on premises on which a constable has seized such liquor are, until the contrary is proved, to be deemed to have been on such premises for the purpose of illegally dealing in intoxicating liquor, and are to be liable to a penalty. The constable may demand the name and address of any such person, and failure to give them or to answer questions satisfactorily will expose him to be apprehended and taken before a justice of the peace.

In *Hayward v. Holland* (21 W. R. 920) it was held that, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of 1872, it was lawful for a licensed victualler to sell beer in a booth at a fair without a special licence for that purpose, on the ground that the Act did not alter the exemption in favour of fairs which had existed since the time of Edward VI. This exemption is expressly abolished by section 18 of the present Act. A discretion is given (section 19) to the justices to specify the hours, between sunrise and ten o'clock at night, during which an occasional licence may authorise the sale of liquor, and the provisions of sections 12—18 of the Act of 1872, as to offences against public order, are extended to the holders of occasional licences (section 20).

Section 22 introduces a novelty, in the shape of a provisional licence, to be applied for by any person interested in premises about to be erected or in course of construction. The provisional grant is not to be of any validity until it has been declared final by order of the licensing justices; but this declaration can only be refused on the ground either that the premises have not been constructed in accordance with the plans submitted, or that some objection exists to the character of the holder of the provisional licence.

As to the grant, confirmation, or renewal of licences, it is provided that one licence of the justices shall comprehend permission to the licensee to take out as many exercise licences as may be specified in it (section 23); that the licensed person is not to be required to attend in person at the annual licensing sessions unless for some special cause personal to himself; that a notice of an intention to oppose the renewal of a licence shall be invalid unless it states in general terms the grounds on which such renewal is to be opposed (section 26); and in place of the Chinese puzzle of legislation held in *Reg. v. Smith* (21 W. R. 382) to have the effect of allowing an appeal from a decision of the magistrates with reference to the grant of new certificates under the Wine and Beer-house Act, 1869, there is enacted a provision (section 27) that no such appeal shall be allowed.

The county licensing committee is empowered to appoint qualified county justices to supply the deficiency where (in boroughs with less than ten justices) there are not, for the time being, three qualified borough justices to form the quota of a joint committee (section 21); and a joint committee is empowered to make rules, under section 43 of the Act of 1872, as to the confirmation of new licences (section 25). A licence to sell liquor not to be drunk on the premises is not to require confirmation by any authority (section 24).

The death is announced of Mr. George Blagrove Snell, the shorthand writer. Mr. Snell was the father of his profession, having followed it actively for upwards of half a century, and regularly attended the assizes on the Northern Circuit for forty years.

JUDICIAL SALARIES AND COMPENSATIONS.

A Parliamentary return recently published gives some interesting details of certain charges on the Consolidated Fund for the administration of justice, including some compensation allowances for abolished offices. The salaries of the judges in England, Scotland, and Ireland are all so charged, while the salaries of the officers of the several courts, which were formerly charged on the funds of their respective courts, are now to be found in the Civil Service Estimates, and are paid out of annual Parliamentary grants. The return before us, which is for the year ending the 31st of March, 1874, shows the sum of £16,900 paid as the salaries of the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Next come the salaries of the Lord Chancellor, the two Lords Justices, the Master of the Rolls, and the three Vice-Chancellors, amounting in the whole to £38,741 7s. 6d. This sum is £258 12s. 6d. less than in ordinary years. There was an interval between the time when Vice-Chancellor Wickens died and the day of the appointment of Vice-Chancellor Hall, and during this interval the salary of a Vice-Chancellor was saved. The six judges and five masters of the Court of Queen's Bench receive salaries amounting in the whole to £40,200. Those of the Court of Common Pleas amounted to £39,358 0s. 10d. Eighteen days intervened between the death of Chief Justice Bovill and the appointment of Lord Coleridge, and this period is represented by £441 19s. 2d., which would otherwise have been paid to the holder of the office of the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, increasing the amount to £39,800. In the Court of Exchequer the salaries of six judges and five masters amounted to £39,999 19s. 11d., but, by some error in calculation, one of the judges, received a penny less than was his due, so that the sum paid should have been £40,000. The judge of the Court of Probate received £5,000. The Chief Judge of the Court of Bankruptcy is paid as Vice-Chancellor. The judge of the High Court of Admiralty receives £4,000, and the Assistant Judge of the Middlesex Sessions £1,200. The county court judges receive salaries of £1,800 or £1,500 a year, and we find a list of fifty-eight county court judges receiving salaries amounting in the whole to £87,450. There are twenty-three police magistrates in London, one of whom receives £1,500, and the rest £1,200, making in all £27,900, and the stipendiary for Chatham and Sheerness receives £700. These salaries amount in the whole to £301,449 8s. 5d.

Various compensation allowances under several Acts of Parliament are also charged on the Consolidated Fund. In the Court of Chancery we find that eight persons, once holders of offices now abolished, receive £6,292 5s. 8d. including £4,028 to the Keeper or Clerk of the Hanaper, who has died within the last few days. There are seven persons receiving compensation to the amount of £3,107 11s. 2d. for abolished offices in the Court of Queen's Bench. The like number receive £2,194 10s. 6d. for abolished offices in the Court of Common Pleas. Amongst these are included a chaplain of the Fleet Prison, a turnkey, and a paymaster of poor prisoners. Fourteen persons divide amongst them £1,914 0s. 6d. as compensation for abolished offices in the Court of Exchequer. Under the Act of 9 & 10 Vict. c. 95, there are several officers of Courts of Requests, forty-six persons in all, who receive between them compensations amounting to £6,586 12s. 9d. A registrar at Swansea, and three keepers of gaols receive £201 12s. 10d. A chaplain of the Marshalsea Prison receives £36, and twelve officers of the Marshalsea Court receive £1,482. For loss of post fines £284 16s. 5d. are paid to sundry titled persons and public bodies, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England being the principal recipients. The largest item in this return, given without detail, is the sum of £72,611 6s. 0d. paid as compensations to officers of the late Ecclesiastical, royal, peculiar and other testamentary courts. Presumably the details are to be found elsewhere, but seeing that names and amounts are given in all other cases the reader naturally looks for them here. An item of £249 11s. 4d. paid as compensation to certain late officers of local courts, makes up with the foregoing sums a total of £397,139 12s. 5d. for salaries and compensations in England charged on the Consolidated Fund.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE NEW COURTS.

The "goodly Hall" of Lincoln's-inn, which has long been spoiled by a partition erected to separate the courts of the Lord Chancellor and Lords Justices, is now restored to its original proportions; and works are in active progress which promise to make of it one of the most spacious and convenient courts we yet possess. The room is somewhere about 71 feet long by 32 feet broad; and although grievously disfigured by the misguided efforts of the architects of the early part of this century, it retains, in the elaborate and curiously-carved screen, put up in 1565, an interesting relic of the days when Charles II. and Prince Rupert were feasted within its walls, and it was the scene of revels, masques, and dances innumerable. The hall, as we learn from Mr. Spilsbury's excellent book on Lincoln's-inn, was erected in 1506; was altered in 1625, 1652, and 1706, and in 1819 was lengthened about ten feet. A ceiling of plaster was then substituted for the old oak roof, and the hideous arcade was added outside to afford a communication to the Vice-Chancellor's court. It is understood that the alterations in progress have for their object the provision of a court which shall be capable of accommodating one of the sections of the Court of Appeal when the constitution of that court shall have been finally determined by Parliament. The new dais is to afford room for a full bench of judges, and the accommodation for counsel, solicitors, and the public is, we believe, to be considerably increased and improved. Perhaps in these days of attention to the education of public taste, it may be suggested that the singular picture painted by Hogarth for the Society in 1750, and hitherto hung above the dais at the northern end of the hall, may be consigned to some less conspicuous position.

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NEW RULES.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Considering the eminent position of the gentlemen who settled the proposed Rules under the Judicature Act, and also that those Rules have been sanctioned by the high authority of the judges, it may seem rather presumptuous to offer criticism upon them; but in some respects they appear to require most serious consideration, and as opportunity is given for amendment, it is in the highest degree desirable that any defects which may be thought to exist should be pointed out. I venture, therefore, to lay before your readers in detail some observations which have occurred to me in going through the draft rules recently issued. If I am wrong in my views, I shall be only too glad to be set right, whereas if I am right I think it will be found that some alteration is necessary.

First, as to the new system of pleading. It will be unnecessary to consider the mode prescribed for the Admiralty and Probate divisions of the court, for the present system, which seems to have answered all purposes, is substantially continued. In other respects the new Rules seem to be founded on the theory of the present system of common law pleading. That theory is undoubtedly perfect. Under it there are supposed to be evolved from the allegations of the parties separate issues of law and fact, but unfortunately in practice it is found that many issues of fact involve questions of law, and many points of law involve questions of fact; so that it has hitherto been found almost impossible to obtain the determination of a common law court on a point of law without giving the court power to draw inferences of fact—that is to say, without admitting that the facts as recorded on the pleadings are not already stated. On the other hand, points of law are, by the present general mode of alleging facts, mixed up with questions of fact. Words can hardly be found sufficiently strong to describe the disadvantages of this. It is an evil to juriesmen, especially in London and Middlesex, where so many causes from other parts of the country are tried, that their time is taken up in finding verdicts as to facts which are already well known and really not disputed—whilst some point of law is reserved for the decision of the court. It is an evil to suitors, who are thus obliged to carry down heavy causes

at an enormous expense for trial at Nisi Prius, when really no question of fact is involved. It is an evil for the court, for the time of the judges is unnecessarily consumed; and it is a great public evil, because it adds to expense and delay in procedure, the getting rid of which is the one great object of legal reform. How often do we see in the reports that a verdict has passed for one party with leave for the other to move on some point of law which ought to have been raised by the pleadings—all the material facts of the case being really admitted on both sides—so saving the enormous expense of carrying the case down for trial at Nisi Prius.

I confess to being one of those who think that there ought to be no such thing as a point of law, except on evidence, reserved on a trial. If either party wishes to raise a point of law he ought to be forced to do so on the pleadings and thus save an unnecessary trial before a jury. If he does not choose to raise it on the pleadings he ought to be precluded from doing so at all. On this account it is with great regret that I see that the Rules expressly provide for the reservation of points other than points as to evidence. I think that the wording of section 46 of the Act might very well have been construed as intended to limit the reservation to such points. I may add that if a party desires to dispute the facts, and also, if the facts are found against him, to raise a point of law, there is ample opportunity for him to do so by obtaining leave to plead and demur. It is curious to note that it must have occurred to the framers of the Rules that something ought to be done in the direction indicated, for by Order XVIII., rule 20, it is expressly provided that "when a contract is alleged in any pleading, a bare denial of the contract by the opposite party shall be construed only as a denial of the making of the contract in fact, and not of its legality or of its sufficiency in law, whether with reference to the Statute of Frauds or otherwise." This is a step in the right direction, but it is far from being sufficient. There ought to be some provision in the Rules preventing any party from raising in any other mode than by setting it forth on the face of the pleadings, a point of law which otherwise may be lying hidden, as it were, amongst the facts.

There is another objection to the Rules as they stand, which is, that they do not provide for facts being separately stated. An illustration will best explain this defect. Suppose a plaintiff, the holder of a bill of exchange, sues one of the indorsers, the plaintiff merely alleges the indorsement by the defendant. The defendant denies the indorsement. This, it seems, is perfectly legitimate under the new Rules, but is it right? The issue "indorsement" or "no indorsement" comprises two branches—one, whether the defendant signed his name on the bill; the other, whether he delivered it for the purpose of transfer. I contend that under a perfect system of pleading each of these issues ought to be raised distinctly. If the defendant denies both the signature and the delivery, of course both questions have to be tried; but if he merely intends to deny the delivery, what is the use of making the other side take down witnesses to the trial to prove the mere signature? To recur to the subject of mixture of law and fact in one allegation, supposing the signature is not disputed, it is not at all unlikely that the question of delivery may turn out to be a mere point of law on facts which if stated on the record would be admitted, without any trial by jury at all. It would therefore seem that the new Rules as to pleading are defective in not providing sufficiently for distinguishing between law and fact, and also between different facts which it is material should be kept distinct. Is there any question that the objects I have pointed out are the objects to be attained by pleading? If there is not, surely it is possible to settle rules which shall meet the case?

While on this subject, I may point out that the Act provides, under certain circumstances, for the trial of feigned issues, and under Order XL., rule 5, a judge may make an order that an issue may be tried for determining the liability of a garnishee, but there is no indication given as to how the disputed points are to be raised. I respectfully submit that the present mode of raising issues is unsatisfactory in the extreme. A mere allegation (on interpleader, for instance) that the goods are the goods of the plaintiff, which is denied by the defendant, raises no distinct point. The proper mode would be to ascertain

what each party alleges, and what is agreed, and if so, the issue should be raised accordingly. Issues should not, as is now frequently the case, be sent to be tried by jury when the only question which can arise is one which the judge must reserve on the trial for the consideration of the court above. There is one very familiar instance which may serve as an illustration, though it is not so frequent as it used to be, in consequence of the power given to the judges to try interpleaders at chambers; I mean the questions which arise as to the sufficiency of the statements in the affidavit filed on registering a bill of sale. Why cannot some provision be made compelling each party to raise the real points of law and fact separately, and also to raise separately from each other all facts which it may be material to keep distinct?

In order that your readers should understand exactly what the new rules as to pleading are, and how far they differ from the old common law system, I give below all the rules which, as I believe, contain anything material to the subject.

Order XVIII. "1. Every pleading shall contain as concisely as may be a statement of the material facts on which the party pleading relies, but not the evidence by which they are to be proved."

"15. Each party in any pleading must allege all such facts, not appearing in the previous pleadings, as he means to rely on, and must raise all such grounds of defence or reply as the case may be, as if not raised on the pleadings would be likely to take the opposite party by surprise, or would raise new issues of fact not arising out of the pleadings, as for instance, fraud, or that any claim has been barred by the Statute of Limitations, or has been released."

"17. It shall not be sufficient for a defendant in his defence to deny generally the facts alleged by the statement of claim, or for a plaintiff in his reply to deny generally the facts alleged in a defence by way of counter claim, but each party must deal specifically with each allegation of fact of which he does not admit the truth."

"18. Subject to the last preceding rule, the plaintiff by his reply may join issue upon the defence, and each party in his pleading, if any subsequent to reply, may join issue upon the previous pleading. Such joinder of issue shall operate as a denial of every material allegation of fact in the pleading upon which issue is joined, but it may except any facts which the party may be willing to admit, and shall then operate as a denial of the facts not so admitted."

"19. When a party in any pleading denies an allegation of fact in the previous pleading of the opposite party, he must not do so evasively, but answer the point of substance. Thus, if it be alleged that he received a certain sum of money, it shall not be sufficient to deny that he received that particular amount, but he must deny that he received that sum or any part thereof, or else set out how much he received. And so when a matter of fact is alleged with divers circumstances, it shall not be sufficient to deny it as alleged along with those circumstances, but a fair and substantial answer must be given."

"20. When a contract is alleged in any pleading, a bare denial of the contract by the opposite party shall be construed only as a denial of the making of the contract in fact, and not of its legality or its sufficiency in law, whether with reference to the Statute of Frauds or otherwise."

"24. Wherever any contract or any relation between any persons does not arise from an express agreement, but is to be implied from a series of letters or conversations, or otherwise from a number of circumstances, it shall be sufficient to allege such contract or relation as a fact, and to refer generally to such letters, conversations, or circumstances, without setting them out in detail. And if in such case the person so pleading desires to rely in the alternative upon more contracts or relations than one as to be implied from such circumstances, he may state the same in the alternative."

Now, I ask, what is there in the above Rules altering or improving the old common law system, except, perhaps, that nothing is said about allowing a general allegation of the performance of conditions precedent, which omission no one will suggest as an improvement? I maintain that at least some definition should be given of what is meant by the word "fact" in the above Rules, which would preclude the possibility of either party including in an allegation of fact or in his denial of such allegation, any point of law on

which he means to rely; and also from including in the allegation of one fact, two or more facts which it is material to keep distinct. Without such definition the new rules as to pleading are no better than, in fact do not materially differ from, the old common law rules.

In my next letter I propose to consider the rules of practice.

E. F. BUTTEMER HARSTON.

1, Gresham-buildings, E.C., Sept. 30.

REVIEWS.

JUDICATURE ACT AND RULES.

The Law and Practice of the Supreme Court of Judicature, comprising the Judicature Act, 1873, the Judicature (Commencement) Act, 1874, the Rules of Court, Notes, Statutes referred to, &c. By WYNNE E. BAXTER, Solicitor to the Supreme Court. Butterworths; Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

This work gives the Judicature Acts and the proposed Rules in a handy form, and provides the assistance of a most copious index, really, as the author says, "almost amounting to a digest." The convenience of such a help to finding the scattered provisions of the Act of 1873, the rules in the schedule, and the proposed rules, is great, and we cannot but think it would have been well if Mr. Baxter had confined the contents of his work to the matters we have mentioned. The 117 pages of small type in the centre of the book appear to us to add little or nothing to its value. The whole or portions of ten statutes referred to in the Judicature Act are printed at length, among them being the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, an enactment, doubtless, important to persons on the point of ascending to the bench or taking office, but hardly of sufficient general interest to justify the reprint in full of its provisions in this work. The notes consist in great measure of references to the statutes bearing on the subjects to which they relate, and a very long string of these references is sometimes hung on a ludicrously small peg. Thus, section 6 of the Judicature Act mentions, among the additional judges of the Court of Appeal, any person who has held in India the office of Chief Justice of, &c., and a note, extending over nearly two pages, is given, under the head "India," stating the years and chapters of the "principal statutes in connection" with that country. Similarly the word "peers," in section 10, gives occasion for a note containing a list of the "principal statutes in connection with this subject." And the word "Act," in section 100, gives rise to a note on "the principal statutes in connection with Acts of Parliament." This is mere book-making, and there is a good deal of it in these notes. Where historical or antiquarian details are given, the sources from which they are derived are frequently either Lord Campbell's works or Wharton's Law Lexicon. Some of these details are not novel—e.g. (p. 154), "Scotland was united to England by 5 Anne, c. 8 (May 1, 1707)"—and others are trivial. Who cares to know (p. 199) that, under 24 Hen. 8, c. 13, the Lord Chancellor might wear "silks of any colours except purple?" If mentioned at all, it ought to have been stated that this Act was repealed by 1 Jac. 1, c. 25. Nor is information to be found which might be reasonably looked for in notes of an archaeological character. Thus, in the note on the degree of serjeant-at-law, which commences with a reference to the practice of appointing judges from amongst the serjeants, we find no attempt to explain how this practice arose, or to point out that in the case of the puisne barons of the Exchequer it was rendered necessary by the provisions of 14 Edw. 3, c. 16. It is probably by an oversight that, under the head, "The Jurisdiction of the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster," that court is described (after Wharton) as still possessing jurisdiction under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1854.

On points of practical importance as to which the provisions of the Judicature Act most need explanation, Mr.

Baxter often contents himself with quoting either from Paterson's Statutes or from the notes in Mr. Haynes' annotated edition of the Act. But even this is better than the course occasionally taken of only referring to another work. The following is the note to the provisions of the concluding clause of sub-section 8 of section 25:—"Mr. Hayne [sic] (Judicature Annotated [sic], p. xvi.) draws attention to the cases of *Talbot v. Hope-Scott*, 4 K. & J. 96; *Lowndes v. Bettle*, 10 Jur. N. S. 226; s.c. 33 L. J. N. S. Ch. 451; *Stanford v. Hurlstone*, L. R. 9 Ch. 116." This is the only explanation vouchsafed of a clause on which, perhaps, more than any other in the Act, the practitioner unfamiliar with the intricacies of equity will desire to have some commentary. There is but one note to the rules of procedure in the schedule, and that merely gives a list of the statutes on the subject of writs in force at the passing of the Judicature Act. We do not find a single note on the proposed Rules. The best part of the book is the index, but that would have been better if the proofs had been more carefully corrected. We observe at least ten errors of the press in two pages (384 and 385).

WORKS RECEIVED.

Essai sur l'Abolition de la Contrainte par Corps. Par HENRI HARDOUIN. Paris, Cosse, Marchal et Billard.

The Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, with introduction, notes, and index. Edited by W. G. BROOKS, M.A., Barrister. H. S. King & Co.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

MR. GEORGE ALFRED SEDGWICK, solicitor, has been appointed one of the Undersheriffs of London and Middlesex. Mr. Sedgwick was admitted in 1862, and is a member of the firm of Elmslie, Forsyth, & Sedgwick.

MR. CHRISTOPHER MOORHOUSE, solicitor, of Liverpool, and deputy town clerk of that borough, has been appointed Town Clerk of Salford. Mr. Moorhouse was admitted in 1855.

MR. WILLIAM TIMBRELL ELLIOTT, solicitor, has been appointed one of the Undersheriffs of London and Middlesex. Mr. Elliott was admitted in 1844.

SIR JOHN SEALY, a member of the Legislative Council of Barbadoes, and lately Attorney-General for that island, has been gazetted a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. The new knight was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. In November, 1833, he was called to the bar at the Middle Temple, and in 1841 became Solicitor-General of Barbadoes. This office he held till 1846, when he was promoted to the Attorney-Generalship of the colony. Sir John Sealy was also for many years a member of the Barbadoes House of Assembly, but resigned his seat in that body in 1858 on being appointed a member of the Legislative Council. He is Chancellor of the diocese of Barbadoes. As Attorney-General of the colony, which office Sir John has recently resigned, he received an official salary of £500 per annum. In 1869 he was nominated a Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL ANDERSON, Attorney-General of the Bahama Islands, who recently received the honour of knighthood, became Speaker of the House of Assembly in the Bahamas in 1831, but retired from the Speakership in 1868. He has been Attorney-General of the colony since 1837. The official salary attached to the Attorney-Generalship of the Bahamas is £400 per annum.

MR. CHARLES JAMES GALE, who has been Judge of the County Court Circuit, No. 51 (Hampshire), since the establishment of that Circuit in 1847, has resigned his office on the ground of permanent illness. Mr. Gale was called to the bar in 1833, and is the author of the well-known treatise on Easements.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY, the Recorder of London, has been nominated umpire by the arbitrators to settle the difficulty in the Durham coal trade.

OBITUARY.

MR. HENRY MARSHALL.

The death of Mr. Henry Marshall, solicitor, formerly Clerk of the Peace for the county of Surrey, took place at Godalming on the 23rd ultimo, at the age of seventy-nine years. Mr. Marshall was admitted an attorney in 1816, so that his professional career extended over a period of fifty-eight years. In his earlier days he greatly exerted himself in procuring the incorporation of Godalming as a municipal borough, and in 1836, on the Act being passed, he was elected its first mayor, which position he filled on six subsequent occasions, the last being in 1863. In August, 1840, he was appointed secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Surrey, and in 1846 he became joint clerk of the county courts of Guildford, Godalming, and Farnham, which office he held till 1856, when, in pursuance of the 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, he ceased to act for Godalming and Farnham, and selected the Guildford district, of the county court of which he became registrar. In October, 1856, on the death of Mr. Woronzow Greig, clerk of the peace for the county of Surrey, Mr. Marshall was selected to be that gentleman's successor, and continued to act in that capacity till 1870, when he was compelled by his increasing infirmities to appoint a deputy. About two years later he resigned the office, being succeeded by Mr. R. H. Wyatt, its present occupant. The late Mr. Marshall resigned the registrarship of the Guildford County Court in 1869. His remains were interred, on the 28th ultimo, in the cemetery at Farncombe, near Godalming, and the funeral was attended by the mayor and corporation of that borough. In early life Mr. Marshall was presented with a service of plate for his exertions in the cause of the Liberal party.

MR. D. C. DE MEDEWE.

The death of Mr. Daniel Charles De Medewe, solicitor, late of Winesham Hall, and of Great Bealings, Suffolk, took place at Hastings on the 27th September, at the age of sixty-two years. The deceased was the eldest surviving son of the late Rev. Philip Meadows, of Winesham, Suffolk, by Elizabeth, daughter of the Rev. Morgan Graves, rector of Redgrave, in the same county, and was born in 1812. Mr. Meadows was admitted an attorney in 1835, and formerly practised at Woodbridge, in Suffolk, but latterly settled at Hastings. In 1855 he resumed his ancient petronymic of De Medewe. He was solicitor to the Hastings and St. Leonards Building and Investment Company (Limited), steward of the manor of Old Longport, and vestry clerk of St. Clement's, Hastings.

MR. JOHN AMERY.

The death of Mr. John Amery, F.S.A., barrister, took place at Eckington, his seat in Worcestershire, at the age of seventy-two years. The deceased gentleman was the eldest and last surviving son of the late John Amery, Esq., of Norton, Yorkshire, by Anne, daughter of John Eccles, Esq. He was called to the bar at Gray's Inn in Trinity Term, 1838, and was a justice of the peace, and deputy-lieutenant for Worcestershire, and a magistrate for the county of Stafford.

MR. JOSEPH GIBBS.

The death is announced of Mr. Joseph Gibbs, barrister. Mr. Gibbs was the eldest son of the late Alderman Michael Gibbs, Lord Mayor of London in 1844-5. He was born in 1809, and was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in 1838, and for some years practised on the Home Circuit. In 1861 he was appointed private secretary to the Lord Mayor, and was re-appointed to that office for twelve years in succession. He had also on many occasions acted as secretary to funds raised by subscription for various charitable purposes during successive mayoralties.

MR. HANS WILLIAM SOTHEY.

We regret to announce the death of Mr. Hans William Sothey, barrister. Mr. Sothey was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and obtained a first class in classics in 1849. In 1852 he obtained the Chancellor's prize for the English essay (subject, "Centralization, its Benefits and Disadvantages"), and he was afterwards elected a Fellow of Exeter College. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1854, and practised for several years as an equity draftsman and conveyancer. Mr. Sothey was 47 years of age at the time of his death, which took place on the 25th ult.

MR. GEORGE FREDERIC HOLROYD.

Mr. George Frederic Holroyd, M.A., barrister, died at Conneragh, near Youghal, on the 10th ult. Mr. Holroyd was the son of Edward Holroyd, Esq., barrister-at-law, many years a Commissioner of the Court of Bankruptcy. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1846 as 33rd wrangler and in the second class of the classical tripos. He was for several years secretary to the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, and in 1865 unsuccessfully contested Northampton in the Conservative interest. Mr. Holroyd was called to the bar in Hilary Term, 1873.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At a meeting of this society, held on Tuesday last, Mr. E. B. Rawlings in the chair, a debate took place on the following question:—"A lease contains a condition against assignment. Is a devise of the lease a breach of such condition?" The speakers in the affirmative were Messrs. Goodman, David Sutton, and Hadley; in the negative, Messrs. Weekes, Browett, and Malins. The voting was in favour of the affirmative.

LEGAL ITEMS.

Mr. C. F. Field, the detective, late chief inspector of the Metropolitan Detective Police, died on Sunday morning.

The name of Mr. William Nichols Marcy, the clerk of the peace for the county of Worcester, has been placed in the commission of the peace for Bewdley, of which borough he was for many years town clerk.

It is stated that the Lord Chancellor has recommended the Treasury to grant a pension to Mr. Vaughan Williams, on his retirement from the office of county court judge. Mr. Williams had only occupied the post since 1863, and therefore would not, but for the state of his health, have been entitled to any pension.

Mr. Thomas Carr Leitch, solicitor, late town clerk of Tynemouth, which office he held for twenty-four years, has been presented with a vase by his fellow-townsmen, who have also placed his portrait (painted by Mr. Rudolf Lehmann) in the Council Chamber of that town, as a memorial of the esteem in which he is held, and of the ability and success with which he has served his native town.

A rather gigantic case was recently heard at the Leeds Police Court, when 240 colliers employed by Bowers's Allerton Collieries Company, Limited, appeared to answer summonses charging them with leaving work without notice. It was ultimately agreed that the summonses against all the defendants should be withdrawn, the defendants to pay the costs of court and half the costs of the hearing. These costs amounted altogether to £95 13s.

A considerable sum in the shape of compensation pensions is saved to the nation by the death on Saturday last of the Rev. Thomas Thurlow, who formerly held the offices of Keeper or Clerk of the Hanaper in the Court of Chancery, of Prothonotary of the Court of Pleas at Durham, and of Patents of Bankrupts in London. The *Globe* extracts from an old work on the subject of the Court of Chancery, written in the year 1714, the following account of the laborious duties of the Clerk of the Hanaper: "The Clerk to the Hanaper, or Hanaper, is sometimes called Warden of the Hamper. His office is to receive all moneys due to the Queen for the seal

of charters, patents, commissions, and writs, and fines due upon writs, as also the fees due to the officers for enrolling and examining the same. He is obliged to attend the Lord Keeper every day in term time, and at all other times when the seal is open, having with him leathern bags (but probably hampers in old time), wherein are put all writs, &c., after they are sealed with the Great Seal, which bags being sealed up by the Lord Keeper with his private seal, are by this officer delivered to the Comptroller of the Hamper, to be disposed of by him as belongs to his office." The office of Patentes of Bankrupts, adds our contemporary, was actually abolished by the Act of 1831, and in respect to Mr. Thurlow's loss of the emoluments of this almost sinecure there was awarded him £7,352 14s. 6d. per annum. This sum, together with £4,028 which he received as Clerk of the Hamper, and £398 as Prothonotary of the Court of Pleas, Durham, make up a total of £11,779, which, as shown by the Finance Accounts presented to Parliament, was annually received by the late Rev. Thomas Thurlow.

A portrait of Mr. Joseph Dodds, solicitor, M.P. for the borough of Stockton, was recently presented to the Corporation of the town by the subscribers and friends of that gentleman. The meeting was convened by ticket in the Borough Hall, and there was present a numerous company of ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Josh. Richardson, J.P., was called upon to preside, and the presentation of the portrait was made by Mr. Edmund Backhouse, M.P. for Darlington. In making the presentation, Mr. Backhouse referred to Mr. Dodds in his various official capacities, and spoke of his industry and untiring energy, and the deep interest he had always evinced in the prosperity of the town of his adoption. The portrait, which is the work of Mr. J. Barrett, artist, of London, is full length. It has been purchased at a cost of £250, and is considered to be a good likeness of the hon. member.

The Kingston Town Council, at a meeting held on Thursday, adopted the following memorial to the Privy Council on the subject of the intended removal of the Assizes from Surrey:—"That your memorialists have heard with dismay and regret of the proposal to abolish the custom which has existed for over 600 years of holding Assizes in the county of Surrey, and that your memorialists are satisfied that such a proposal, if carried into effect, will be highly detrimental to the best interests of the county, and will work gross injustice to many of its inhabitants, for the following, among other, reasons:—1st. Because the public administration of the law in the sight of the community is most salutary and beneficial by not only inspiring in the public mind a due respect for the authority of the law of the land, but by the open demonstration of the consequences of crime in its detection and punishment, and by the abolition of Assizes in Surrey the people of the county will be practically disfranchised from these advantages (except as regards Courts of Petty Sessions), and they will thus be placed in an inferior condition to that which they have occupied for 600 years 2nd. Because the county of Surrey is in respect of its population and wealth one of the most important and increasing counties of the kingdom, and it is unjust to it that it should be deprived of its ancient rights and privileges, and be placed on a lower scale of importance than counties of far less magnitude. 3rd. Because great hardship would be inflicted on the jurors of the county should such a proposal be carried out, as they would have to attend to their duties as jurymen at far greater expense, time, and labour, by having to attend in London instead of in the neighbourhood of their residences. 4th. Because it frequently happens that cases arise where it is for the obvious advantage of the suitors that actions should be tried where the cause of action has arisen. In actions where local rights or customs, or where personal character are involved, it is often important to the parties concerned that a local trial should take place. 5th. Because the towns of the county of Surrey, and especially that of your memorialists, have gone to great expense in providing public courts, grand jury rooms, houses of detention, and other public buildings for the holding of the Assizes and the accommodation of her Majesty's Judges, and such expense will be in a great measure entirely lost unless due and proper compensation is made to such towns. 6th. Because by a proper rearrangement of the sittings in London and Middlesex, and by confining the Assizes in Surrey to the trial of cases belonging properly to the county, any inconvenience at present sustained by the Bench, the Bar, or the public may be duly met without the ancient rights and privileges enjoyed by the county being taken away."

COURT PAPERS.

NOTICE.

During the Remainder of the Vacation until further notice:—All applications which are of an urgent nature, are to be made to the Master of the Rolls for the Vice-Chancellor Sir Charles Hall.

The Master of the Rolls will sit at the Rolls House, on Wednesday in every week till further notice, for the purpose of hearing such applications, at 12.30 p.m.

The necessary papers relating to every application are to be left at the Vice-Chancellor's chambers, if possible, before one o'clock on the day previous to that on which the application is intended to be made.

In any case of great urgency the brief of counsel is to be sent to the Master of the Rolls by book-post, or parcel, prepaid, accompanied by office copies of the affidavits in support of the application, and also by a minute in duplicate, on separate sheets of paper, signed by counsel, of the order he may consider the applicant entitled to, and an envelope capable of receiving the papers, with sufficient stamps affixed thereon, and addressed as follows: "To the Registrar in Vacation, Chancery Registrar's Office, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.," and also a stamped envelope (addressed to the solicitor), to contain one of such minutes.

On applications for injunctions or writs of Ne exeat Regno, in addition to the above, there must also be sent a copy of the bill, and a certificate of bill filed.

The papers sent to the Master of the Rolls will, when an order is not made thereon, be returned to the solicitor; when an order is made thereon one copy of the minute of the order will be sent to the solicitor, and the other papers will be sent to the registrar.

Applications for leave to give notice of motion, may be made to the chief clerk of the Vice-Chancellor Hall.

The Master of the Rolls' address can be obtained at the Vice-Chancellor Hall's chambers, No. 14, Chancery-lane.

The chambers of the Vice-Chancellor will be open on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, in every week, from 11 till 1 o'clock.

Vice-Chancellor Hall's Chambers,
14, Chancery-lane, 1st October, 1874.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Oct. 2, 1874.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½	Annuities, April, '85 9½
Ditto for Account, Nov 92½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
3 per Cent. Reduced 90½ x d	Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 1 pm.
New 3 per Cent., 90½ x d	Ditto, £500, Do 1 pm.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £500, 1 pm.
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 5
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year)
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	121
Stock Caledonian	100	92½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	88
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	43½
Stock Great Northern	100	140½
Stock Do., A Stock	100	162
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	108
Stock Great Western—Original	100	115½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	142½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	85
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	24
Stock London and North-Western	100	132½
Stock London and South-Western	100	115
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	72½
Stock Metropolitan	100	60½
Stock Do., District	100	30½
Stock Midland	100	135
Stock North British	100	64½
Stock North Eastern	100	111
Stock North Staffordshire	100	64
Stock South Devon	100	63
Stock South-Eastern	100	112½

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Bank rate was not altered on Thursday, but the proportion of reserve to liabilities has fallen from about 50 last

week to about 43 this week. On Tuesday the railway market was dull, but on Wednesday there was an improvement, succeeded, however, on Thursday by a reaction. In the foreign market there was a further advance in Egyptian and Turkish securities on Saturday and Monday, and the market generally has throughout the week been firm. Consols on Thursday closed at 92½ to 3 for money and 92½ to 3 for the account.

Mr. William Abbot, in his monthly circular, suggests that the London, Chatham and Dover Ordinary Stock offers to those desiring to secure a yearly increasing sum for children on their attaining their majorities, and to others for prospective financial purposes, a novel, certain, and absolutely secure mode of investment, which has not hitherto been made the subject of prudent accumulation, or provision for the future, that praiseworthy object having hitherto been mainly accomplished by means of life insurance, and endowment policies.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

CLIFT—On Sept. 28, at Upper Norwood, Surrey, the wife of Frederic Clift, solicitor, of a son.
MARTINEAU—On Sept. 27, at 26, Calthorpe-road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, the wife of Thomas Martineau, solicitor, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

DRAKE—**PAGE**—On Sept. 24, at Canterbury Cathedral, Charles Henry Drake, Esq., of Exeter, solicitor, to Frances Elizabeth, widow of the late William Joyce Page, Esq., of Edgbaston, Warwickshire.

POPE—**WHITING**—On Sept. 23, at St. George's, Hanover-square, Alfred Pope, of Dorchester, Dorset, solicitor, to Elizabeth Mary, second daughter of Amos Whiting, of St. George's-square, S.W.

WOOLER—**HEALOP**—On Sept. 26, at the parish church of St. Mary's, Scarborough, Edward Wooler, Esq., of Harewood-hill, Darlington, solicitor, to Dora, only daughter of the late Robert Healop, Esq., of Darlington.

DEATHS.

BANISTER—On Sept. 26, at 21, Acre-lane, Brixton, Thomas Banister, Esq., barrister-at-law, of 5, Child's-place, Inner Temple.

DE MEDEWE—On Sept. 27, Daniel Charles De Medewe, Esq., F.G.H.S., of Hastings and Dalston, solicitor, aged 62.

NOTLEY—On Sept. 20, at Riverdale-terrace, Richmond, John Notley, Esq., late of New-inn, solicitor, aged 70.

ROOTH—On Sept. 19, at Teignmouth, John Wilcoxon Rooth, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law.

SOTHEBY—On Sept. 25, at 93, Onslow-square, Hans William Sotheby, Esq., Member of Lincoln's-inn, aged 47.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Sept. 25, 1874.

Clifton, John Henry, and Henry Davis Woodward, Wind st, Swansea, attorneys and solicitors. Sept 23

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Sept. 25, 1874.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

West Cumberland Union C-lleries, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Meles dated July 31, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Lewis and Lewis, Elly place, Hilborn, solicitors for the petitioner.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Cribber Colliery Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Sept 24, directed to be heard before V.C. Little, on Oct 4, at 11, at Cross at Chambers, Cross at, Manchester. Farlington and Allen, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioner.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 95.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Sept. 25, 1874.

Bland, James, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Fishing Merchant. Nov 26.
Clowes and Son, Great Yarmouth
Calby, Thomas, York. E. q. Nov 1. Richardson and Co, York
Carter, John, Ferrybidge, York, Seal Merchant. Nov 21. Bradley and Bradley, Castleford
Carter, Thomas, Ferrybidge, York, out of business. Nov 21. Bradley and Bradley, Castleford
Chadwick, William, M.A., Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Nov 30.
Shipley, Manchester
Colbank, James, Fen Church at, Merchant. Dec 4. Woodard, Ingram Court, Fen Church at
Goodam, William, Hockland St Mary, Norfolk, Gent. Nov 21.
Copeman and Son, London

Harding, Susannah Maria, Acorn, York. Nov 9. Richardson and Co, York
Kipling, Susannah Elizabeth, Victoria rd, Kentish Town. Nov 21
Bradley and Bradley, Castleford
Miner, John, Tavistock crescent, Westbourne Park, Weymouth and Spirit Merchant. Dec 2. Hoyle, Cannon st
Murray, Thomas, Engineer, R.N., H.M.S. Charybdis. Oct 23.
Hilbreth and Ommanney, Norfolk st, Strand
Richardson, Thomas, Ewhurst, Sussex, Farmer. Dec 1. Raper and Ellman, Baitle
Rook, James, Austin rd, Battersea, Barge Owner. Oct 31. Robinson, Gresham House, Old Broad st
Saunders, Rees, Brynllafach, Carmarthen, Farmer. Nov 7. Lloyd, Lampeter
Sergison, Rev William Thomas, Slaughtam, Sussex, Rector. Oct 31.
Cullington and Slaughter, Mansfield st, Portland place
Spalding, Richard Carr, Leasdale villas, Brentford rd, Colonel. Nov 2
Jenkinson and Co, Corbet court, Gracechurch st
Stebbling, Rankin Joseph, Southampton, Optician. Nov 24. Wootah and Co, Leadenhall st
Trow, Richard, Axbridge, Somerset, Gent. Nov 29. Woolfryas, Axbridge
Verey, George, Gloucester crescent, Regent's Park, Gent. Oct 31.
Clarkson and Co, Carter lane, Doctors' commons
Whilton, Charles Joseph, Castle Bromwich, Warwick, Butcher. Nov 7.
Blewitt, Waterloo st, Birmingham
Whitely, Nathan, Smithy Cough, Halifax, York, Cotton Spinner. Oct 31.
Holt, Rippenden
Williams, David, Pontrhiwllan, Nantewille, Cardigan, Merchant. Nov 7. Lloyd, Lampeter
Williams, Joseph, Chief Engineer, R.N. Surrey terrace, L-wishan rd, Oct 23. Ommanney, Norfolk st, Strand
Willis, George, Scarborough, York, Gent. Nov 23. Moody and Co, Scarborough
Wilson, Myrry, Melthold Hall, Norfolk, Farmer. Nov 6. Housham, Theford
Woolf, Henry, Queen's terrace, Victoria Park, Hackney, Cap Manufacturer. Oct 19. Spyer and Son, Winchester House, Jid Broad st

TUESDAY, Sept 15, 1874.

Bown, Robert, Lieut-Col. Colstream Guards Dec 1. Tamplin and Co, Fenchurch st
Butt, Charles, Milborne Wick, Somerset, Yeoman. Nov 23. Bennett, Bruton
Colmore, Mary Anne, A-ton nigh Birmingham. Oct 31. Beale and Co, Birmingham
Cov-y, John, A-re-ford, Southwark, Sergeant. Nov 1. Bailey and White, Winchester
Edwards, Evin, Tulaishat, Pambey, Carmarthen, Farmer. Oct 21. Fencal, Llanelly
Hodgson, William, Doncaster, York, Innkeeper. Oct 31. Fisher, Doncaster
Holmes, Walter, Faversham, Kent, Grocer. Oct 31. Giraud, Faversham
Lewis, Elizabeth Jane Woodhouse, Hereford Nov 21. Walters and Co, Lincoln's inn
Mathews, Ann, Castle Cary, Somerset. Oct 22. Bennett, Bruton
Mullens, James, Blechem place, St John's Wood, Gent. Nov 23.
Edward Miles, Graecoarch st
Naylor, Harriett, Bristol. Dec 1. Livet, Bristol
Pidsley, Richard Hayward, Exeter, Auctioneer. Nov 1. Huggins, Exeter
Pike, Josiah Gregory, Cumber Hill, Darby, Silk Agent. Oct 22. Moody, Derby
Popplewell, William, New Leaton, Nottingham, Victualler. Oct 31.
Hunt and Co, Nottingham
Robins, Ann, Lower Park row, East Greenwich. Nov 1. Brett, West st, Finsbury circus
Scott, Robert, Colchester, Essex, Coaldealer. Nov 10. Smythies and Co, Colchester
Shedden, Alexander, Brecknock rd, Kentish Town, Gnat. Nov 1.
Pearce and Son, Gt. t. p. at
Smith, Charles Joseph Oliver, Nottingham, Surgeon. Nov 1. Wells and Hind, Nottingham
Spain, James, Dover, Kent, Boatman. Nov 21. Stilwell, Dover
Thornwell, Thomas, (otherwise Thorswork), Birmingham, House Agent. Oct 31. Beale and Co, Birmingham
Watson, Sarah, Saint Paul's st, New North rd, Islington, Spinster. Nov 2. Broughton, Finsbury square
Wedge, Francis, Knightlow hill, Warwick, Gent. Oct 23. Holbeche and Addenbrooke, Sutton Coldfield
Wilton, Nathaniel, Bredfield, Suffolk, Farmer. Oct 19. Brooks, Woodbridge
White, John Richard, Bruton, Somerset, Gent. Nov 23. Bennett, Bruton
Wrench, Rev Jacob George, Clapton Vicarage, Hackney. Nov 7.
Wharson and Ford, Lincoln's inn fields

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Sept. 25, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1849.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in the Country.

Farmer, Thomas Hutton, and William Brown, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturers. Pet Sept 23. Patchitt, Nottingham, Oct 9 at 3.
Kershaw, Edmund, Uverston, Lancashire, Beer-seller. Pet Sept 21.
Postlethwaite, Uverston, Oct 6 at 10
Parkinson, James, Halifax, Yorkshire. Pet Sept 19. Mankin, Halifax, Oct 5 at 11

TUESDAY, Sept. 22, 1874

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1833.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Merrill, R. Pennfield, Poplar, Licensed Victualler. Pet Sept 25. Pocher, Oct 13 at 11.30

Northmore, Mary, Edgeware rd, Lodging house keeper. Pet Sept 24.
Spring-Rice. Oct 9 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Davis, William, Crowsmore, Somerset, Builder. Pet Sept 24. Batten.
Tewill, Oct 15 at 11
Elliott, Sutton John, Portsmouth, Hants, Solicitor. Pet Sept 25.
Howard, Portsmouth, Oct 30 at 2

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

Tuesday, Sept 29, 1874.

Hodge, Alfred, Kingston-upon-Hull, Seed Crusher. Sep 17

Liquidation by Arrangement FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

Tuesday, Sept 22, 1874.

Addison, Charlotte, Castleford, York, Grocer. Sept 30 at 3 at the
Commercial Hotel, Albion st, Leeds. Stocks and Nettleton, Castle-
ford
Baldwin, Thomas, Mare st, Hackney, Plumber. Oct 15 at 3 at offices
of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd. Fenton, Coltbrook row
Baxandall, Rosamond, and Emma Louisa Baxandall, Bramley, York.
Housing a School. Oct 5 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson,
Market st, Bradford.

Bernberg, Moses, Newport, Monmouth, Jeweller. Oct 5 at 12 at
offices of Lane, Lion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
Black, Alexander, Bower, Northumberland, Newton Park, out of
business. Sept 30 at 2 at offices of Nicholson, Bridge st, Morpeth
Blomfield, Miles, East Dereham, Norfolk, Soda Water Manufacturer.
Oct 6 at 12 at offices of Emerson and Sparrow, Rampant Horse st,
Norwich

Boyles, Martin, Stafford, General Dealer. Oct 5 at 3 at offices of Jaques,
Cherry st, Birmingham
Burgess, Thomas, and William Andrews, West Lavington, Wilts.
Grocers. Oct 2 at 11 at office of Randall, Exchange place, Devizes.
Day, Devizes

Cameron, Thomas, Chatham, Kent, Victualler. Oct 6 at 3 at offices
of Basset, High st, Rochester

Clark, Elizabeth Ann, Harrogate, York, Licensed Victualler. Oct 5 at
11 at offices of Hurst and Capes, Harrogate
Cochrane, Charles, Gracechurch st, Coal Merchant. Sept 30 at 2 at
the Black Bull Hotel, Holborn. Bateson, Corporation chambers,
Guildhall

Coghlan, Mary Catherine, Orchard st, Portman square, Scholastic
Agent. Oct 2 at 2 at offices of Slater and Pannell, Guildhall cham-
bers, Basinghall st. Wrightland Nicoll, Great Portland st
De Croy, Charles Maria, Great George st, Westminster, Financial
Agent. Oct 16 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st.
Lumley and Lumley, Old Jewry chambers

Denison, Samuel, Knarborough, York, Innkeeper. Oct 5 at 2 at
offices of North and Sons, East parade, Leeds

Dick, Emily, Guild st, Upminster. Oct 2 at 12 at offices of Smart
and Co, Chesapeake. Carr and Co, Basinghall st
Dickinson, Joshua Steel, Gateshead, Durham, Chemist. Oct 5 at 2 at
offices of Eldon, Royal arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Ellis, Sarah, Rhyl, Flint, Lapidary. Oct 5 at 4 at offices of Ross and
Price, North John st, Liverpool. Williams, Rhyl

Evans, Alfred, Preston, Lancashire, Coal Agent. Oct 6 at 12 at offices
of Fryer, Lune st, Preston

Evans, John, Redditch, Worcester, Grocer. Oct 5 at 11 at offices of
Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury

Fisher, Emanuel Joseph, Maidenhead, Berks, Bootmaker. Oct 7 at 3
at offices of Durant, Clarence villa, Windsor

Foreman, James, Norwich, Butcher. Oct 1 at 12 at the office of the
Registrar, Redwell st, Norwich

Forrester, Robert, Osney, Cumberland, Farmer. Oct 9 at 2 at offices
of Armon, Devonshire st, Penrith

Fox, Richard Lloyd, Holywell, Flint, Grocer. Sept 23 at 11 at the
Elbowm Hotel, Cheshire. Pugh, Holywell

Fox, Catherine, Broughton, Cheshire, Cotton Spinner. Oct 1 at 11 at
offices of Nicholson, Grosvenor chambers, Cheshire

Gals, Alfred Chaplin, Gaisford st, Mineral Water Manufacturer. Oct 13
at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Ashley and Fox,
Fredericks place, Old Jewry

Gerland, Thomas, Liverpool, Glass Cutter. Oct 9 at 3 at offices of
Ritson, Dale st, Liverpool

Gill, Charles John, Southampton, Merchant's Clerk. Oct 1 at 2 at
offices of Kilby, Portland st, Southampton

Good, William Lewis, Bishopsgate st Within, Seedsman. Oct 13 at 11
at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate st within. Houghton, St
Helens place

Gordon, Sygers, Burslem, Stafford, Draper. Oct 5 at 11 at offices of
Sutton, Burslem

Hall, James Ebrank, Nottingham, Builder. Oct 9 at 12 at offices of
Enfield and Downson, Low pavement, Nottingham

Halls, Philip William, Shrewsbury, Salop, Licensed Victualler. Oct
7 at 11 at offices of Clarke, Swan hill, Shrewsbury

Harris, William, Princess st, Edgeware rd, Builder. Sept 30 at 4 at
Ridley's Hotel, Holborn. Yorks, Marylebone rd

Hartley, Elijah, Burnley, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. Oct 3 at 3 at
offices of Artindale and Artindale, Hargreaves st, Burnley

Hastie, James, Brighton, Sussex, Gent. Oct 16 at 3 at offices of Clennell
and Fraser, Great James st, Bedford row. Brandreth, Brighton

Hellyer, Frederick, East India rd, Poplar, Ship Carver. Oct 1 at 12
at offices of Gausseant, New Broad st

Henwood, William, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Draper. Oct 9 at 2
at offices of Parsons, Nichols st, Bristol. Slater and Co, Weston-
super-Mare

Hewitt, Robert, North Kilworth, Leicester, Journeyman Wheelwright.
Oct 5 at 3 at offices of Shires, Market st, Leicester

Hill, Samuel John, Trowbridge, Wilts, Bed Maker. Sept 23 at 2 at
offices of Shirehall, Market house, Trowbridge

Hodge, Henry, West Tisbury, Devon, Baker. Oct 2 at 11 at offices
of Hirsell, Queen st, Exeter

Horton, Richard, Normanton, York, Watchmaker. Oct 2 at 2 at offices
of Turner, East parade, Leeds

Ingram, John, Hedonstead, Stafford, Carpenter. Oct 2 at 2 at offices of
Teyman, Scotland House, Hedonstead

Judd, George Esakiel, and Richard Judd, Birmingham, Wholesale
Druggists. Oct 6 at 3 at the Great Western Hotel, Monmouth st,
Birmingham. Buller, Birmingham

Judd, William, Winchester, Hants, Fruiterer. Oct 9 at 11 at the Royal
Hotel, St Peter st, Winchester. Faithfull, Winchester

King, George John, Abingdon, Berks, Builder. Oct 6 at 3 at the Crown
and Thistle Hotel, Abingdon

Kirkham, Dennis, Norwich, Cabinet Maker. Oct 5 at 11 at offices of
Miller and Co, Bank chambers, Norwich

Lampen, George Walker, Higher Broughton, near Manchester,
Stationer. Oct 2 at 3 at offices of Edwards and Bliniff, Brazennose st,
Manchester

Lansley, John, Winchester, Blacksmith. Oct 7 at 11 at offices of Bailey
and White, Jerry st, Winchester

Latta, Frances, Leigh, Lancashire, Tea Dealer. Oct 7 at 11 at offices of
Jones, Princess st, Manchester

Laughlin, John, Greenford, Middlesex, Schoolmaster. Oct 12 at 3 at
offices of Rhodes, Churchcourt, Clements lane

Lazarus, Jacob, Basinghall st, Clothier. Oct 13 at 3 at the Cannon
Hotel. Crook and Smith, Fenchurch st

Leff, John, Kingston-upon-Hull, out of business. Oct 5 at 3 at offices
of Summers, Manor st, Hull

McDonald, William, Sheffield, Draper. Oct 2 at 2 at offices of Taylor,
Norfolk row, Sheffield

McMaster, Duncan, Westfield, Nottingham, Draper. Oct 6 at 1 at the
White Hart Hotel, East Retford. Bescoy, East Retford

Middleton, George, Leeds, Dyer. Oct 5 at 2 at offices of Simpson and
Burrell, Albion st, Leeds

Minto, Edward, Houghton-le-Spring, Durham, Saddler. Oct 2 at 3 at
offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland

Morris, George William, and Henry Alfred Williams, Chiddingfold,
Surrey, Machinists. Oct 1 at 2 at the White Lion Hotel, Guildford

Myatt, William, and Joseph Myatt, Farworth, Lancashire, Builders.
Oct 5 at 3 at offices of Rutter, Mawdsley st, Bolton

Nicklin, Henry, Hanley, Stafford, Furniture Dealer. Oct 2 at 4 at 26,
Cheapside, Hanley

Pearce, John Harris, Oxford, at Jeweller Oct 15 at 2 at offices of Har-
court and Macarthur, Moorgate st

Philippe, John, North Elmham, Norfolk, Dealer in Fowls. Oct 7 at 3 at
the King's Head inn, East Dereham. Emerson and Sparrow,
Norwich

Price, John, Nottingham, Stonemason. Oct 9 at 11 at offices of Black,
Low pavement, Nottingham

Ramsay, Robert, Thomas Goodwin, and Alexander Campbell, Swansea,
Glamorgan, Travelling Drapers. Oct 1 at 11 at offices of Barnard and
Co, Temple st, Swansea. Davies and Hartland, Swansea

Ramsden, Charles William, Wakefield, York, Watchmaker. Oct 5 at 2
at offices of Fisher, Waterloo st, Birmingham. Harrison and Smith,
Wakefield

Rollison, James Thomas, Charles st, St George's-in-the-East, Grocer.
Sept 30 at 2 at Ridley's Hotel, Holborn. Marshall

Smith, Thomas, Nottingham, Grocer. Oct 6 at 13 at the Assembly
Rooms, Low pavement, Nottingham. Fraser

Synon, Edmund John, Hartford, Huntingdon, Surgeon. Sept 30 at 12
at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Hannynban, Huntingdon

Taylor, Elizabeth, Holm Mill, Scout, Lancashire, Felt Manufacturer.
Oct 7 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Waterfoot. Hargreaves and Knowles,
Newchurch

Tear, David, Sheffield, York, Draper. Oct 2 at 4 at offices of Binney
and Sons, Queen st chambers, Sheffield

Tolley, James, Handsforth, Stafford, Commercial Traveller. Oct 3 at
3 at offices of Hodgson, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Tomlin, Tom, Leicester, Merchant. Oct 5 at 4 at offices of Shires
Market st, Leicester

Wainman, James Collingwood, Nottingham, Cabinet Maker. Oct 5 at
12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham

Wall, James, Birmingham, Factor. Oct 7 at 2 at offices of Buller,
Moort st, Birmingham

Walton, James, and Thomas Warburton, Manchester, Beachers. Oct
6 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Barton,
Manchester

Watson, John, Llanelli, Carmarthen, Draper. Oct 13 at 3 at offices of
Clifton and Woodward, Wind st, Swansea

Webb, Edward Russell, Oldbury, Worcester, Boat Builder. Oct 5 at 3
at offices of Wright, Church st, Oldbury

Westwood, Isaac, Ironbridge, Salop. Oct 7 at 1 at the Union Hotel,
Birmingham. Haslewood Jun

Whorton, John, Dudley, Worcester, Grocer. Oct 3 at 3 at offices of
Warrington, Castle st, Dudley

Wiglesworth, John, Leeds, Grocer. Oct 2 at 3 at offices of Granger,
Bank st, Leeds

FRIDAY, Sept 23, 1874.

Amess, John, Bristol, Sawyer. Oct 10 at 12 at offices of Sherrard,
Nicholas st, Bristol

Ashworth, George, Manchester, Commission Agent. Oct 20 at 2 at
offices of Jones, Albert chambers, Albert bridge, Manchester

Atlay, Henry, Leeds, Grocer. Oct 5 at 3 at Wharton's Hotel,
Park lane, Leeds. Pickering, Leeds

Baldwi, William, West Cannock, Stafford, Carpenter. Oct 9 at 2 at
offices of Glover, Cannock

Box, Joseph, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Watchmaker. Oct 5 at 10.30 at
offices of Potter, Northfield House, North place, Cheltenham

Brown, Archibald, Barrow-in-Furness, Tailor. Oct 6 at 11 at offices of
Bradshaw and Pearson, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness

Channell, M y Elizabeth, Rottlingdean, Sussex. Oct 12 at 2 at offices
of O'Brien, James inn, Strand

Denman, Thomas, Camberwell rd, Florist. Oct 13 at 3 at offices of
Webb and Pearson, Austin Friars

Edmond, James, Mayton st, Seven Sisters rd, Upper Holloway, out of
business. Oct 7 at 3 at offices of Lovett, King William st

Edwards, Edmund, Birmingham, General Draper. Oct 9 at 3 at
offices of Rowlands and Bagnall, Clomore row, Birmingham

Edwards, John Kendrick, Birmingham, Painter. Oct 8 at 12 at offices
of Fowke, Ann st, Birmingham

Evans, Thomas, Llandaff, Glamorgan, out of business. Oct 9 at 11
at offices of Bleiloch, St Mary st, Cardiff

Eyre, John, Dalton, York, Grocer. Oct 7 at 3 at offices of Drake, John William, Huddersfield.

Ford, Benjamin, Wollaston, Worcester, Ore Dealer. Oct 5 at 10 at offices of Prescott, High st, Stourbridge.

Harvey, John, Grove rd, Holloway, Gasfitter. Oct 14 at 2 at offices of Pearce, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane, Capreol, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane.

Hewitt, Richard, Dewsbury, York, Woolen Manufacturer. Oct 6 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Dewsbury. Ibberson, Dewsbury.

Hewitt, Samuel, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Printer. Oct 9 at 11 at offices of Barnard and Co, Crookherstown, Cardiff. Waldron, Cardiff.

Hey, Julius, Liverpool, Boot Maker. Oct 9 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool.

Hodgson, John, Durham, Grocer. Oct 7 at 3 at offices of Folkard, Claypath, Durham.

Holmes, John, Keighley, York, Grocer. Oct 13 at 11 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Leigh, Manchester.

Hopgood, George, Winchester, Upholsterer. Oct 13 at 12 at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate st, Godwin, Winchester.

Hutsen, John, and Henry Hutsen, High st, Sydenham, Builders. Oct 16 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Hardwick and Holmes, Leadenhall st.

Hyrons, Joseph, Kingwinford, Stafford, Boot Maker. Oct 7 at 3 at offices of Warrington, Castle st, Dudley.

Irving, John, Manchester, Builder. Oct 13 at 3 at offices of Mann, Cooper st, Manchester.

James, Thomas, Birmingham, Corn Dealer. Oct 6 at 3 at offices of Parry, Bennett's hill, Birmingham.

Knebel, Samuel Frederick, Staining lane, Gresham st West, Bzadie. Oct 6 at 11 at offices of Cooper, Portman st, Portman square.

Knott, Stephen, Corbridge, Northumberland, Blacksmith. Oct 8 at 12 at offices of Baty, Hexham.

Lew, George, Ringwood, Southampton, Grocer. Oct 9 at 12 at offices of Moore and Bowers, Wimborne Minster.

Marshall, John, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Hair Dresser. Oct 7 at 3 at offices of Stratton, Queen st, Wolverhampton.

Mathias, James, Narberth, Pembroke, Boot Maker. Oct 9 at 11 at offices of Lascelles, Narberth.

Nicholson, William, Carlisle, Clothier. Oct 7 at 11 at offices of Wannop, Carruthers court, Scotch st, Carlisle.

Paltheorpe, Joseph, Lissant, Liverpool, Broker. Oct 15 at 2 at offices of Gibson and Boland, South John st, Liverpool. Anderson and Co, Liverpool.

Peace, Job, Denby Dale, York, Manufacturer. Oct 8 at 3 at the County Court, Queen st, Huddersfield. Berry.

Pearce, Thomas, Panzance, Cornwall, Boot Maker. Oct 10 at 3 at the Public Rooms, Truro. Hodge and Co.

Richardson, William, Liverpool, Tailor. Oct 12 at 3 at offices of Nordons, Cook st, Liverpool.

Roberts, David, Plasnewydd, Denbigh, Farmer. Oct 8 at 1 at offices of Adams, Castle st, Ruthin.

Simmons, Simon, Bishopsgate st Without, Hat Manufacturer. Oct 8 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Waring, Gresham buildings, Guildhall.

Spiller, William, Oxford, Coal Retailer. Oct 9 at 2 at offices of Thompson, Church st, St Ebbe's, Oxford.

Tabbs, Joseph, Leeds, Hop Merchant. Oct 2 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Wellington st, Leeds. Spirett.

Tucker, George, Hildfield, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Watchmaker. Oct 9 at 11 at Sharp's Hotel, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness.

Taylor, Barrow-in-Furness.

Thistlethwaite, James, Barnley, Lancashire, Draper. Oct 9 at 11 at offices of Crowther and Co, Bath chambers, York st, Manchester.

Backhouses and Whittam, Burnley.

Tilley, George, Cheltenham, Grocer. Oct 14 at 3 at offices of Stroud, Clarence parade, Cheltenham.

Tyler, William George, Watlington terrace, Upper Holloway, Draper. Oct 8 at 3 at offices of Howe, Staple inn, Holborn. Morris, Staple inn, Holborn.

Watchorn, Clifton John, Church rd, Homerton, Grocer. Oct 7 at 3 at the City Arms, Bloomfield st. Lind, Beaufort buildings, Strand.

Weich, John Thomas, Tiverton, nr Bath, Somerset, Licensed Victualler. Oct 7 at 11 at offices of Barkum, Northumberland buildings, Bath.

Yeadon, John, Idle, York, Butcher. Oct 10 at 10 at offices of Neil, Union passage, Bradford.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS.



By Special Appointment To HER MAJESTY, THE LORD CHANCELLOR, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSELS' DITTO. CORPORATION ROBES.

UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS, &c.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON.

FUNERAL REFORM.—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the General Office, 3 Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

SECOND EDITION.

Price 1s. Post free, 1s. 1d.,

THE LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAY:

ITS POSITION ANALYSED AND ITS PROSPECTS REVIEWED, BY WILLIAM ABBOTT,

Stock Exchange, London.

BATES, HENDY, & CO., Publishers, 4, Old Jewry, London, E.C.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Mr. Abbott not only dissects the concern, but takes each feature of it in detail, examines it with the most painstaking minuteness, and combines the result of his investigations in a synopsis which is at once luminous and convincing. His skill in work of this kind is universally admitted. He has long exercised it in demonstration of the value of submarine telegraphs, and his recent analysis of the conditions of joint-stock banking in this country is regarded as the work of a gentleman who ought conversant, not only with the theory, but also with the facts of finance, being, as it is, at once scientific and practical."—*Railway News*.

"How a railway, the hopelessness of whose financial position at and for some time after the disastrous commercial crisis of 1866 acquired for it the cautionary title of 'The Lost Capital and Debenture Railroad Company,' may, in a comparatively short period, satisfy the greater portion of its parliamentary obligations, and give promise of a remunerative future to its ordinary shareholders, is familiarly explained in a brochure recently published, entitled, 'The London, Chatham, and Dover Railway: its Position Analyzed and its Prospects Reviewed,' by William Abbott, Stock Exchange."—*The Illustrated London News*.

"Both to these holders and to the holders of Railway Stocks generally, we think the facts and figures cited by Mr. Abbott are of sufficient moment to warrant a somewhat extended abstract of them."—*Money Market Review*.

"Mr. William Abbott has just produced a pamphlet (published by Messrs. Bates, Hendy, and Co.), in which he has at great length and with great care passed in review the present position and prospects of the company. Showing the substantial and improving character of our home railways in general, and how vastly even the worst of them have improved in time, he states what the London, Chatham, and Dover's position is and what it may be at no distant period."—*Hampton's Railway Journal*.

"It is replete with minute information."—*Birmingham Morning News*.

"Gives a review of the progress of the Company, which really offers some remarkable points for consideration."—*Bullionist*.

"We recommend to the attentive perusal of our readers, and all who are interested in the above Company, a pamphlet which has just been issued by Mr. William Abbott, of the Stock Exchange, bearing the title 'The London, Chatham, and Dover Railway: its Position Analyzed, and its Prospects Reviewed.' Mr. Abbott's standing in the commercial world is such as to entitle his views on this and cognate subjects to high consideration."—*Railway Record*.

"Mr. William Abbott, of the Stock Exchange, has just published a very able analysis of the position and a review of the prospects of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway."—*Morning Post*.

"This work is not simply what it purports to be. It is a dissertation on unemployed capital and the causes of its accumulation, and on railway stocks generally as investments. The work also discusses the history, position, and prospects of railway debenture and preference stocks, and elaborately compares the value of these with ordinary stocks. The prospect of non-dividend ordinary stocks are also treated upon by Mr. Abbott. On the fourth page he approaches the subject of his title, and gives what may be well termed the history and mystery of the London, Chatham, and Dover line. . . . The work is worth an attentive perusal; it is written lucidly and 'got up' well."—*Morning Advertiser*.

"He has analysed most minutely the general position of the line."—*Standard*.

"Mr. William Abbott has issued a pamphlet showing the present position and prospects of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway. A table is given exhibiting the progress made during the last seven years in the net revenue of the company, and the rate of the working expenses for each of the years. The new sources of traffic are also pointed out, and favourable anticipations are expressed as to their development."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"It very forcibly recites the circumstances and the recent experience of the company."—*Echo*.

"An interesting work."—*Lloyd's List*.

"This review of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, and of its position and prospects, is a contribution regarding both in a roseate hue by Mr. William Abbott, a well-known member of the London Stock Exchange. Mr. Abbott has the happy knack, only resulting from a large business experience, of forming definite opinions and of expounding them in pointed and explicit language."—*Investors' Guardian*.

"Mr. Abbott marshals his facts by figures and his arguments with great skill."—*Monetary Times*.

"Since the recent half-yearly meeting, both the ordinary and preference shares of the company have daily improved, and is owing to purchases based more or less upon views which have been embodied in a published statement by Mr. Abbott.—*York Herald*.

"To all who are interested in the progress of railway property generally we recommend a perusal of a well-compiled and freshly written pamphlet, entitled 'The London, Chatham, and Dover Railway: its Position Analyzed, and its Prospects Reviewed.'"—*Irish Times*.

"Mr. Abbott has evidently great faith in the future for English railways, and states his opinions with force and clearness."—*Sunday Times*.

"Offers some remarkable points for consideration."—*Edinburgh Daily Review*.

"He sets forth his views very ably as to the future prospects of the railway."—*Chatham News*.

"I'll say no more at present, except to add a word of thanks to Mr. Abbott, to whom the shareholders of the company owe a debt of gratitude. He has told the public the truth, and done the company justice."—*Figure*.

"Every person at all interested in this important line should become possessed of this valuable publication, which cannot be perused without profit to the reader."—*Pacific Mail*.